



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/040,799	01/07/2002	Leonard E. Frey	END920010075US1	2893

7590 09/22/2006

John R. Pivnichny, Ph.D
IBM Corporation, N50/040-4
1701 North Street
Endicott, NY 13760

EXAMINER

CHANNAVAJJALA, SRIRAMA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2166

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/040,799	FREY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Srirama Channavajjala	2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-19 pending in this application.
2. In view of the appeal Brief filed on 7/7/2005, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY **REOPENED**. A new rejection to the pending claims 1-19 is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

Drawings

3. The drawings filed on 1/7/2002 are accepted for examination purpose, however,.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statement filed on 1/7/2002, is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97 has been considered and a copy was enclosed with this office action, mailed on 5/10/2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1,8,15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In the specification **Fig 4A-4B description is not provided related to "one or more transaction, each having a key and a detail" as claimed in claim 1,8,15.** In the specification, although at page 10, line 21-23 merely states fig 4 shown key and detail, also fig 3B do not show element numbers

Claims 2-7,9-14,16-19 depend from claims 1,8,15 respectively also rejected in the analysis above.

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claim1, 8,15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is not clear what is meant by "one or more transaction, each having a key and a detail". Examiner assumes transactions in a database related to record identifier and other attributes in the office action and treated in the present office action.

Claims 2-7,9-14,16-19 depend from claims 1,8,15 respectively also rejected in the analysis above.

No new matter should be entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brodersen et al., [hereafter Brodersen], US Patent No. 6405220 filed on July 6,2001 in view of Raz, US Patent No. 6292827

Art Unit: 2166

10. As to Claims 1,8,15, Brodersen teaches a system which including 'processing transactions' [col 3, line 5-11], processing transactions corresponds to transactions entering into transaction log, creating transaction files to other workgroup user clients as detailed in col 3, line 5-11

'providing a plurality of processing databases each having a respective agent' [fig 9, col 15, line 27-36], plurality of processing databases corresponds to fig 9, elements 3, 23a, 305 and their respective agent corresponds to fig 9, element 315

'providing a transaction database' [col 15, line 37-43, line 58-65], transaction database corresponds to transactions in the transaction log as detailed in col 15, line 58-65

'writing one or more transactions, each having a key and a detail, from a first of said plurality of processing databases to said transaction database' [col 10, line 8-13, line 59-64] Brodersen specifically teaches writing transaction log to nodes, particularly function of log on a node is to record a transaction for propagation to central system as detailed in col 10, line 8-13;;

'periodically searching, using a processing agent from a second of said plurality of processing databases' [col 16, line 5-11], Brodersen specifically teaches multi-user docking clients that allows processing data between multiple user databases and master database as detailed in col 16, line 5-11; 'transaction database for a key and detail to determine whether said processing agent should process said one or more transactions' [col 16, line 21-26] Brodersen specifically teaches creating transaction in

Art Unit: 2166

local database, entering the transaction into transaction log and processing transactions as detailed in col 16, line 21-26;

'updating a record in said second of said plurality of processing databases, by using said key and detail' [col 16, line 37-40], Brodersen specifically teaches transaction log entries are copies on the master database and updating the transaction into master database as detailed in col 16, line 37-40.

It is however, noted that Brodersen does not specifically teach 'databases of plurality of types', plurality of databases having a different type than said first of said plurality of databases', although Brodersen teaches distributed transactional databases that allows multiple workgroup user clients, updating transaction log or files between headquarter master database and workgroup database as detailed in fig 9, col 15, line 15-26 . On the other hand, Raz specifically teaches 'databases of plurality of types' [col 9, line 31-35], databases plurality of types corresponds to Raz's RDBMS and non-RDBMS as detailed in col 9, line 31-35; 'plurality of databases having a different type than said first of said plurality of databases' [fig 4,col 7, line 52-54, col 9, line 31-35], different type of databases corresponds to relational databases and non-relational databases because JDBC supports open data base connection and a standard way of interfacing with different types of databases as detailed in col 7, line 52-54.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Raz into Brodersen et al. because both Raz, Brodersen are directed to distributed databases, more specifically Brodersen

Art Unit: 2166

is directed to database management system including master database server and work group user client databases, creating transaction files and updating the transaction into workgroup databases [fig 9, Abstract], while Raz is directed to dynamically distribution of data and management of information, more specifically, dynamically re-distributing data between data servers and clients [see Abstract, col 3, line 28-35].

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would have been motivated to combine the references because that would have allowed users of Brodersen et al. to use Raz's "open data base connection or "ODBC" protocol that establishes a standard way of interfacing with different types of databases [Raz: col 7, line 52-54], more specifically connecting both relational database and non-relational database that permits an exchange of information between client and server databases, furthermore dynamically controls the location, access and transfer of information between client and servers in a network system as suggested by Raz [col 1, line 55-67], bringing the advantages of reliable network for information or database transactional information, and improving the performance of the dynamic distribution information [col 1, line 34-36].

11. As to Claim 2,9,16, Brodersen teaches a system which including 'transaction database is a messaging database' [col 5, line 8-15, fig 1].

Art Unit: 2166

12. As to Claim 4, 11,18, Brodersen teaches a system which including 'one or more transactions has a processor designation specifying which of said plurality of processing databases is affected by said each of said one or more transactions' [col 5, line 18-26, line 49-55].

13. As to Claims 6,13, Brodersen teaches a system which including 'transferring said one or more transactions from said transaction database to said second of said plurality of processing databases prior to said step of updating a record' [col 8, line 51-67, col 9, line 1-4, col 10, line 37-50]

14. As to Claims 7,14,19, Brodersen teaches a system which including 'setting a status flag in said one or more transactions' [col 11, line 1-17].

15. As to Claim 3, 10, Raz teaches a system which including 'transaction database, is a LOTUS NOTES database and said plurality of processing databases are adapted to read said LOTUS NOTES database' [fig 4, col 8, line 39-42].

16. As to Claim 5, 12,17, Brodersen disclosed 'key includes a wildcard character' [col 16, line 62-67].

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments in the pre appeal brief, filed on 7/7/2005, with respect to the rejection of claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as stated above.


Conclusion


The prior art made of record

- | | | |
|----|---------------|---------|
| a. | US Patent.No. | 6405220 |
| b. | US Patent No. | 6292827 |

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is 571-272-4108. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alam, Hosain, T, can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

sc
Patent Examiner.
September 14, 2006. 


Alam, Hosain, T
SPE, AU2166.